STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

Grass	rass Valley				Valley		
Inspected	by:	Sgt.	M. /	A. Lav	vrend		

Division:

Command:

6 Date: 12/11/20

"XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 1 of 3

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" enter the next level of command where the document shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innovative practices, suggestions for statewide improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be used if additional space is required. TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Corrective Action Plan Included Total hours expended on the inspection: ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level Attachments Included 4 ☐ Executive Office Level Forward to: Follow-up Required: Valley Division Due Date: 01/15/2010 X No Yes Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices: Area maintains multiple records for all contract/special project overtime expenses. A separate record (binder) for the current Area specific grant PT0907 is maintained. This binder contains copies of all reports forwarded to the Grants Management Unit along with assets acquired through the program. Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Due to a high volume of COZEEP/MAZEEP reimbursed projects, provisions should be included to charge administrative time (Program setup / reconciliation) to these programs. Area often expends up to 20 hours per month to accomplish these tasks Inspector's Findings: Area is in compliance with will all Departmental policies.

Commander's Response:
Concur or Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)

STATE ÖF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

"XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Grass Valley	Valley	6
Inspected by: Sgt. M.	Date: 12/11/2009	

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Grass Valley	Valley	6
Inspected by: Sgt. M	. A. Lawrence	Date: 12/11/2009

				1
Required Action:	: None			
Corrective Action	n Plan/Timeline			

Employee would	like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer	Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	12 1 11 2 tong?	1/11/00
(366 111 10 9.1, 0	Shapter o for appear procedures.)	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
		MC Mille	12-11 2009
	issed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
employee	☐ Do not concur	C. H. Mithethan	
		MADMINGTO DEVICE	12/21/09

CHP 680A (Rev. 02-09) OPI 010

STATE OF CALIFORNIA PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Grass Valley	Division: Valley	Number: 230
Evaluated by: Sgt. M. A. Lawre	Date: 12/11/2009	
Assisted by: J. Mahffey, OSS)	Date: 12/11/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.					
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signat	ure:		
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level					
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	10		MU		
Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-up Inspection ☐ Yes	Command		i. Triv	Date: 1211-05	
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 ote: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation.					
1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: PT 0907 SR-49 Safety Corridor	
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: PT 0907 SR-49 Safety Corridor	
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA :PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks: All purchases of assets approved by GMU
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Reports are forwarded monthly
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: To be completed August 2010
Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
 Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18.	. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Funds expended for enforcement or enforcement support only.
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	it Unit		3. C. A.S. S.	
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GML2	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

TPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

JOMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command:	Division: Valley	Number: 230		
Grass Valley				
Evaluated by:	Date:			
Sgt. M. A. Lawre	12/11/2009			
Assisted by:		Date:		
Jan Mahaffey, OSS		12/11/2009		

applica discrep Further	ble legal statues, or deficie ancies and/or deficiencies more, the Exceptions Docu	ual items with "Yes" or "No" answers ncies noted in the inspections shall shall be documented on an Excepti iment shall include any follow-up ar ion" box shall be marked and only c	be commer ons Docum ad/or correct	nted on via t ent and add tive action(s	the "Remar! Iressed to t i) taken. If	ks" section. A he next level this form is us	Additionally, such of command.
,							
TYPE O	FINSPECTION		Lead inspe	ector's Signat	ure:	//	
Div	ision Level	⊠ Command Level	1	1111			
	191011 EBVCI	Ed Commune Ecoci		16	////2	lee	
Exe	ecutive Office Level	□ Voluntary Self-Inspection	101		CAC		
	llow-up Required:		Commande	er's Signature	3.		Date:
		Follow-up Inspection			1 6		12-11-09
Г	Yes 🛛 No	•	C. K	1. W. K.	Mori)	.21767
HPM 4							
Note:	fa "No" or "N/A" box is o	checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for e	xplanation		
	Is the hiring company/a						rea has completed six
	overtime being held res			☐ No	□ N/A		details in fiscal year
	minimum of four hours					2009-2010 (
	uniformed employee, re	egardiess of length of					
2	service/detail?	ours overtime being allocated					
۷.		d employee(s) if cancellation	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
		hours or less prior to the					
		e assigned CHP uniformed					
		notified of such cancellation?					
3.		al project codes being used		_		Domorko:	
		ted with reimbursable special	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	projects?				ļ		
4.		uring nonuniformed personnel	Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
		reflected on the Report of mbursable Special Projects?		[] 140	L IWA		
	Is the commander ensu						
J.		aimed for an employee, other	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	than Bargaining Unit 7,						
		or hours worked during their					
	regular work shift time?						
6.		in the "Notes" section of the		Kramala .		Romarko: A4	15 system generates a
		ecord, for overtime worked on	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Supplementa	
	a regular day off?	1 - 6 0 1 0					
1.		ort of Court Appearance - for each officer or sergeant	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	when overtime is assoc		□ 100	L. 140	L IVA		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA TPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Did the supervisor sign the CHP 415s approving the overtime?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: A415 Reviewers must sign electronically sign the document prior to submission to MIS
	 Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters? 	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13	. Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Monitored monthly by the Area Commander
14	. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: As reasonable as possible. Some overtime has been incurred due to changes from shift length, 9 hours to 12 hours.
	. Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: